

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 and 28 are pending in the present Application. Claim 27 was previously canceled. Independent claims 1 and 19 are currently amended to include the element "a group access level for various management capabilities, wherein a level has a group name with an associated list of network devices." The element is taught in the specification on pages 34 and 35, and in Figs. 4a-4i. Claims 4-7 are amended to reflect the change in antecedence.

Claims 1-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daly (USP 5748896) in view of Lewis (USP 6421719). Regarding claims 1, 19, 21, 23, and 28, Daly discloses (Figs. 1-11 and col. 1, line 5 to col. 18, line 67) a method of managing a telecommunications network comprising generating a plurality of user profiles that provide network management access, where each profile defines network management capabilities assigned to a respective user. The user profile is added to the network management system (Fig. 5a, new user button is used to add new user profile). The user profile can be edited to establish management capabilities assigned to one or more users associated with the profile (Figs. 5b-3 and Fig. 5c used to edit the parameters for allowing the user to establish management capabilities). There is a list of network devices capable of being managed or configured through the scope of the user profile (Figs. 5a, 5B-1, and 5B-3 which include the servers that allow the user to set access level such as read and write, or read only; see col. 10, lines 28-66; col. 12, lines 8-21; col. 12, line 66 to col. 13, lines 28). Input is received from a user through the user interface. The network device is configured ("server which forwards the requested information by generating the data packets") from the list of network devices within the user profile in accordance with the management capabilities in the user profile (col. 12, lines 8-21, the user configures the hard drive or folder to be shared with the other users and set access level for the interface). The Examiner admits that Daly does not disclose a management method for configuring the physical and logical of network devices that are performing routing the packets. In the same field of endeavor, Lewis discloses a management method which allows a network

administrator to add or delete users, and configure the physical and logical of the switches, routers, bridges, and hubs in the network based on the administrator profile and provision the services within a network device to route the packets (col. 1, lines 37-63, and col. 34-58, the switch is configured physical and logical of the switches to route the packets).

The Examiner concludes that since Daly suggests a flexible method and system for integrating a new management method and device into a network without re-implementing the network, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method for configuring the physically and logically of the network devices as disclosed by Lewis.

Claim 1 is currently amended to include a group access level for various management capabilities, wherein a level has a group name with an associated list of network devices. While the Applicants concur that it is generally known to apply user profiles in operating systems such as Windows NT and in databases, as the Examiner points out Daly does not disclose a management method for configuring the physical and logical of network devices. Lewis teaches the use of configuration management functions, wherein (Col. 1, lines 59-63) the "Configuration information is typically entered/changed/deleted manually (i.e. through a dumb terminal), or manually/automatically by a network management system executing what is referred to as a configuration management program." Lewis does not teach the association of profiles with a configuration management program. Furthermore, Lewis does not teach that the network devices can be associated with a group name, which can further be associated with a profile. Generally, "to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the cited limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka* 490 Fed. 2nd 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974). "A statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references."

M.P.E.P. '2143.02, citing Ex Parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q. 2nd 1300 (Bd. Pat. App., 1993). Currently, the Examiner has not provided a reference to support the claim of obviousness relating to the above-cited elements in claim 1. Indeed, Lewis does not bolster the Examiner's argument, and the Examiner has admitted that Daly does not teach all the elements. The use of another layer of abstraction, a group name to associate a name with a list of network devices, where the group name can then be applied to profile is not obvious. The rejection is respectfully overcome.

The Examiner states regarding claims 2 and 18, Daly discloses providing network management access further comprises displaying a user interface in a graphical user interface (GUI) in accordance with the user profile (Fig. 5).

In claims 2 and 18, Applicants are claiming that the GUI is tailored to a profile where in light of the dependency on claim 1 refers to access to configure one or more network devices. Daly teaches the use of views that are associated with an interface action (col. 10, line 23). The User/Group component manages accounts, and Group is not associated with a particular group of devices. In light of the foregoing arguments and the currently amended claim 1, claims 2 and 18 are believed to be allowable.

The Examiner states regarding claims 3 and 20, Daly discloses the network management system includes a plurality of user profiles and receiving a user name and password; comparing the received user name and password against user names and passwords stored in the plurality of user profiles; and displaying a user interface in accordance with a user profile, including the received user name and password (col 10, lines 45-54). Regarding claim 4, Daly discloses defining management capabilities comprises assigning an access level corresponding to specific management capabilities (Fig. 5).

Claims 3 and 20 are allowable in light of their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner states regarding claims 5-7, Daly discloses assigning an access level comprises assigning an administrator access level to permit a user to read and write physical and logical objects; a provisioned access level to permit a user to read physical objects and read and write logical objects; a customer access level to permit a user to read their logical objects (Figs. 5b-3).

In claims 5-7, Applicants' claim an access level that is associated with a profile and a group name. Daly does not teach this additional level of abstraction.

The Examiner states regarding claims 14-17, Daly discloses setting network management policy flags within the user profile for setting a password control policy flag to enable a user to change a password within the user profile; setting an account disabled policy flag to disable the user profile and prevent access; setting an add device policy flag to enable a user to add network devices to the list of devices capable of being managed through the user profile (Fig. 5 discloses a user set the flag for changing password, disable account, and adding a network device).

The Examiner is in error. There is no reference in Daly to flags or policy or policy flags, as claimed in claims 14-17. Claims 14-17 depend from claim 1 and, in view of the arguments and the amendment, are believed to be allowed.

The Examiner states regarding claim 25, Daly discloses receiving user profile data from a user and modifying parameters within the user profile in accordance with the received user profile data (Fig. 5c, receiving the parameters of the user profiles from the user and modifying the parameters in the user profile database according to the received information such password).

Applicants note that while independent claim is rejected, no basis for the rejection is proffered. This is relevant as claim 25 depends from claim 19. Addressing claim 19, which is currently amended to include a group access level for various management

capabilities, wherein a level has a group name with an associated list of network devices. Applicants' arguments for claim 1 are generally applicable to claim 19. Currently, the Examiner has not provided a reference to support the claim of obviousness relating to the above-cited elements in claim 1. Indeed, Lewis does not bolster the Examiner's argument, and the Examiner has admitted that Daly does not teach all the elements. The use of another layer of abstraction, a group name to associate a name with a list of network devices, where the group name can then be applied to profile is not obvious. The rejection is respectfully overcome. As to claim 25, which includes an additional step in the method of claim 19, similar arguments are applicable. Claims 19 and 25 should be allowed.

The Examiner states regarding claim 26, Daly discloses copying the user profile to another user profile; and editing parameters within the other user profile to establish management capabilities and a list of network devices capable of being managed through the other user profile (Fig. 5, duplicate USER and modifying the parameters to create a new user).

Applicants' claim 26 claims group names, and where a profile has the same group name then different users will be presented with the same view (page 35, lines 3-6). In other words, a list of network devices can be managed through the other user profile. There is no counterpart in Daly. Applicant is not claiming a duplicate user or a duplicate profile, but profiles that share a common view when there are common group names.

The Examiner states regarding claims 8-11, Daly and Lewis fail to disclose the claimed invention. However, the Examiner takes an official notice that an advantage of providing a list of network addresses of the network devices wherein listing network devices further comprises listing an SNMP community string, retry value, timeout for each network device are well known and expected in the art at the time invention was made to manage the network devices on the network. Regarding claims 12-13, Daly and Lewis fail to fully disclose the claimed invention. However, the Examiner takes an official notice

that a method and advantage of designating a primary and secondary network management server associated with the user profile are well known in the art at the time invention was made to implement a primary and backup server for allowing the user to access the network. The motivation would have been to reduce a down time of the network. Regarding claim 22, Daly and Lewis fail to fully disclose claimed invention. However, the Examiner takes an official notice that a method and advantage for enabling or disabling a port of the network device is well known and expected in the art at the time of invention was made to provide a network security. Regarding claim 24, Daly and Lewis fail to disclose the claimed invention. However, a method and system for allowing a network administrator to set up a SONET path within the network device is well known and expected in the art at the time of invention was made to implement a function into a terminal for allowing a user to set a SONET path according to the access level which is defined in the access control list.

Applicants' claims 8-11 and 12-13 depend from claim 1, and are allowable by virtue of their dependency. Applicants' claims 22 and 24 depend from claim 19, and are allowable by virtue of their dependency.


There is no new matter, and there are no new claims or fees due.

CONCLUSION

Applicants would like to thank Examiner for the attention and consideration accorded the present Application. Should Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place the Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact undersigned Counsel at the telephone number, facsimile number, address, or email address provided below. It is not believed that any fees for additional claims, extensions of time, or the like are required. However, if such additional fees are required, Examiner is encouraged to notify undersigned Counsel at Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2005


Christopher L. Bernard
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 48,234

F. Rhett Brockington, Ph.D
Agent for Applicants
Registration No.: 29,618

DOUGHERTY | CLEMENTS
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA

Telephone: 704.366.6642
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
cbernard@worldpatents.com